




he presented in his § 2255 motion to vacate, the present motion simply reiterates his belief that his prior California conviction was not for a felony offense, and that counsel was ineffective for failing to adequately address this issue. The Court considered and denied these claims. (Doc. No. 13). Petitioner's disagreement with the Court's legal conclusion provides no basis for Rule 59(e) relief.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that:

(1) Petitioner's "Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment Under Rule 59(e) Fed.R.Civ.P.," (Doc. No. 15), is **DENIED**.

Signed: October 26, 2017

  
Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
United States District Judge

